



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,991	01/03/2002	Homare Kanie	62807-029	1110

7590 07/08/2004
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,991

Applicant(s)

KANIE ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy was filed on 7/25/2002 after the filing date of the current application No. 10/034991 on 1/3/2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/25/2002 was filed after the filing date of the current invention on 1/3/2002. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not in the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure and it is a mere copy of claim 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 2, line 6, misspelled word “basised” instead of “based”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doi et al. (US Patent 6,247,010).

7. Doi anticipated independent claim 1 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of “extracting related words relating to an input key word and terms of validity of the related words” as the input analyzing module that analyses text entered by the user

and extracts a search key word (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 47-54). Doi further teaches the claimed step of "retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words" based on the extracted search key words the related information searching modules searches for related information (Fig. 1, 3, col. 7, lines 36-46). Finally, Doi teaches the claimed step of "selecting documents in the extracted terms of validity from among the retrieved documents" based on the search results collected by the plurality of search keys the search instruction acceptance display-controlling module selects the display format of the interaction element accepted from the user (Fig. 1, 4, col. 8, lines 21-37).

8. Doi anticipated independent claim 2 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of "extracting related words relating to an input key word and terms of validity of the related words" as the input analyzing module that analyses text entered by the user and extracts a search key word (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 47-54). Doi further teaches the claimed step of "retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words and using retrieval indexes of the related words that satisfy the terms of validity, included in the retrieval indexes of every unit term" (examiner interprets related keywords are also indexes for documents) based on the search results collected by the plurality of search key words and the search instruction acceptance display controlling

module selects the display format of the interaction element accepted from the user (Fig. 1, 4, col. 8, lines 21-37).

9. Doi anticipated independent claim 3 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of "extracting related words relating to an input key word" as the input analyzing module analyses text entered by the user and extracts a search keys (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 47-54). Doi further teaches the claimed step of "retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words" based on the extracted search keys the related information searching modules searches for related information (Fig. 1, 3, col. 7, lines 36-46). Finally, Doi teaches the claimed step of "acquiring terms of validity of the related words relating to the input key word, and selecting documents that satisfy the acquired terms of validity from among the retrieved documents" (terms of validity is related terms as per the specification) as the related information search system searches for and displays under formulation to help formulate the document (Fig. 5, col. 8, lines 50-63).

10. Doi anticipated independent claim 5 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts

a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of “extracting related words relating to an input key word and terms of validity of the related words” as the input analyzing module that analyses text entered by the user and extracts a search key word (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 47-54). Doi further teaches the claimed step of “retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words” based on the extracted search key words the related information searching modules searches for related information (Fig. 1, 3, col. 7, lines 36-46). Finally, Doi teaches the claimed step of “selecting documents that satisfy the extracted terms of validity from among the retrieved documents” based on the search results collected by the plurality of search keys the search instruction acceptance display-controlling module selects the display format of the interaction element accepted from the user (Fig. 1, 4, col. 8, lines 21-37).

11. Doi anticipated independent claim 6 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of “extracting related words relating to an input key word and terms of validity of the related words” as the input analyzing module analyses text entered by the user and extracts a search key word (Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 47-54). Doi further teaches the claimed step of “retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words” based on the extracted search key words the related information searching modules

searches for related information (Fig. 1, 3, col. 7, lines 36-46). Finally, Doi teaches the claimed step of "selecting documents that satisfy the extracted terms of validity from the retrieved documents" based on the search results collected by the plurality of search keys the search instruction acceptance display-controlling module selects the display format of the interaction element accepted from the user (Fig. 1, 4, col. 8, lines 21-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doi et al. (US Patent 6,247,010) and in view of Masuichi et al. (US Patent 6,076,086).

14. Doi teaches independent claim 4 by disclosing a system to search for information related to entered key words and presents searched information to the user with a minimum interruption to user's document formulation. An input analyzer extracts a search key from the text entered by the user (see abstract). Doi teaches the claimed step of "a retrieval processing section for retrieving documents by using the extracted related words as retrieval words" based on the extracted search keys the related information searching modules searches for related information (Fig. 1, 3, col. 7, lines 36-46). Finally, Doi teaches the claimed step of "a retrieval result selection processing section for selecting documents that satisfy the extracted terms of validity from the retrieved documents" based on the search results collected by the plurality of search key words the search instruction acceptance display controlling module selects the display format of the interaction element accepted from the user (Fig. 1, 4, col. 8, lines 21-37).

Doi teaches the system to search for information related to user entered key words and presents searched information to the user. Doi does not teach explicitly presenting searched information with the creation date. However, Masuichi teaches documents retrieving system for searching user-entered key words and related documents based on time and the claimed step of "a time serial related word development processing section for extracting related words relating to an input key word and terms of validity of the related words" as the associate document retrieving system obtains a set of documents properly matching the retrieval expression with creation date (Fig. 2A-B, 4, col. 10, lines 12-19 and col. 12, lines 24-27). Thus, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because Masuichi's teaching allows a retrieval expression to include the data of creation/publication to obtain appropriate associate documents (Fig. 2, col. 10, lines 25-29). Furthermore, timestamp as taught by Masuichi's improves the user confidence and meets an increasing need for establishing not only the integrity of an electronic document but the exact date and time.

Other Cited References

15. The following references are cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

A) Horowitz et al. (US Patent 6,236,987) discloses organizational and navigational aids to the user to facilitate exploration and analysis of a document collection.

B) Kitajima et al. (US Patent 6,415,285) discloses document retrieval by mediating a search request from a user to databases provided with keywords.

C) Linoff et al. (US Patent 5,953,723) discloses a document query processing system.

D) Li et al. (US Patent 6,631,496) discloses user to organize hypertext document querying, navigating, sharing and viewing.

E) Morita (US Patent 5,168,565) discloses a keyword connection table contains relation information of keyword connection.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

17. If a reference indicated, as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2177

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sathyaharayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

srp
June 28, 2004